

REMARKS

In the Office Action dated December 5, 2003, claims 10-35, 47, and 48 were rejected. Claims 10, 17, 21, 33-35, and 47-48 have been amended. No new matter has been added. The claims have been amended for purposes of clarifying the invention and not for purposes of patentability. Claims 10-35 and 47-48 are now pending in the application. In view of the amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the application.

Rejections under § 112

Examiner states that in claim 17 “a coloring book” on line 5 and “a coloring book” on line 3 is not clear whether they are the same. Applicants respectfully submit that “a coloring book” as referenced on line 5 is different from “a coloring book image” as referenced on line 3.

Rejections under § 103

Claims 10, 13-20, 34, 35, and 48 were rejected under U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent No. 6,356,274 (hereinafter Spector) in view of US Patent No. 6,373,551 (hereinafter Manico) and US Patent No. 6,099,928 (hereinafter Chee). Applicants respectfully disagree.

Chee discloses a transparency mat card comprising a mat with a window and a transparency mounted in the window using a weak, removable glue applied to portions of a glue border so that the transparency can be detached intact from the mat card. A picture or other visual pattern is preferably printed or otherwise marked on the transparency, preferably on the rear surface. (Abstract)

Chee further discloses that messages or greetings can be written on either side of the back portion of the card. Messages such as doodles, extra

notations, advertisements, or announcements may be written on the front portion of the card as well. Messages or decorative elements may be added to the transparency or to the mat card by the manufacturer, or by the consumer, or by the consumer in concert with the manufacturer (as in coloring books, or "paint by number" works). (col. 3, lines 15-23)

Chee further discloses that the designs are printed by means of a printer on a clear medium such as an acetate. Each original picture is then trimmed by hand or machine so as to conform to the dimensions of the mat card windows. (col. 7, lines 39-57) Applicants believe that Chee teaches the use of multiple image wherein each image is printed in a separate surface. Further, Applicants also believe Chee teaches the use of separate surfaces for the transparency and the mat card.

Applicants believe that Spector in view of Manico and Chee fail to hint, suggest, nor teach (either singly or in combination) the automatic creation of a coloring book or story board both containing multiple coloring book images on a single surface.

In marked contrast, claims 10, 35, and 48 disclose the creation of a story board which is composed of a plurality of coloring book images on a single surface. Further, claims 17 and 34 disclose a coloring book having each page printed in a single surface. Accordingly, independent claims 10, 17, 34, 35, and 48 are now in condition for allowance. In addition, claims 13-16 depend directly or indirectly on independent claim 10, and therefore, are patentable for at least the same reasons discussed above. In addition, claims 18-20 depend directly or indirectly on independent claim 17, and therefore, are patentable for at least the same reasons discussed above.

Claims 21, 22, 26, 31, 32, 33, and 47 were rejected under U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Spector in view of Chee. In marked contrast, claims

21, 33, and 47 disclose a coloring book having each page printed in a single surface Accordingly, independent claims 21, 33, and 47 are now in condition for allowance. In addition, claims 22, 26, 31, and 32 depend directly or indirectly on independent claim 21, and therefore, are patentable for at least the same reasons discussed above.

Claims 23-25 were rejected under U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Spector in view of Chee and further in view of EP 0713788. Claims 23-25 depend directly or indirectly on independent claim 21, and therefore, are patentable for at least the same reasons discussed above.

Claims 27-30 were rejected under U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Spector in view of Chee and further in view of Manico. Claims 27-30 depend directly or indirectly on independent claim 21, and therefore, are patentable for at least the same reasons discussed above.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that all pending claims are in condition for allowance. Such allowance is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner finds any remaining impediment to the prompt allowance of these claims that could be clarified with a telephone conference, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Richard H. Butler at (408) 223-9763.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 4/5/04


Richard H. Butler
Registration No. 40,932

Please Send Correspondence to:
Valley Oak Law
5655 Silver Creek Valley Road
#106
San Jose, CA 95138
(408)223-9763